DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 167 UD 020 361

AUTHOR Valadez, Concepcion M.
TITLE What Do We Know About Teaching and Learning in Urban Schools? Volume 12: Basic Skills in Urban Schools: A View from the Bilingual Classroom.
INSTITUTION Central Midwestern Regional Educational Lab., Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 40p.: Paper prepared for the Urban Education Program, CEMREL, Inc.'s National Conference on Urban Education (St. Louis, MO, July 10-14, 1978). For related documents see UD 020 351-361 and UD 020 363.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement: *Bilingual Education: *Educational Environment: *Educational Legislation: Elementary Secondary Education: Ethnicity: *Program Effectiveness: *School Community Relationship: Self Concept: Social Influences: Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Reasons for slow gains in the goals and objectives of bilingual education, despite Federal and State support, are explored in this paper. The definitions of and legal mandate behind bilingual programs and the relationships between these programs and the rest of the educational system and local community are discussed. Focused on here are school and community perceptions of bilingual program goals, social dynamics between the program and the school in which it is situated, and teacher/staff attitudes. In order to illustrate the effectiveness of bilingual education, several studies concerning English acquisition, reading, writing and mathematics, and the development of self concept and ethnic identity within bilingual programs are briefly reviewed. Finally, the lack of properly prepared teaching staff and of appropriate teaching materials and evaluation techniques are identified and discussed as limitations to the uniform effectiveness of bilingual education. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FEB 8 3 1980

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT TEACHING AND LEARNING IN URBAN SCHOOLS?

ED185167

Volume 12

Basic Skills in Urban Schools: A View from the Bilingual Classroom

Concepcion M. Valadez
University of California, Los Angeles

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

URBAN
PROGRAM

CG 20361

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT TEACHING AND LEARNING IN URBAN SCHOOLS?

Volume 12

Basic Skills in Urban Schools: A View from the Bilingual Classroom

Concepcion M. Valadez
University of California, Los Angeles

Paper prepared for the National Conference on Urban Education, held in St. Louis, Missouri, July 10-14, 1978.
Conducted by the Urban Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., with support from the National Institute of Education.

CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri

FEB 2 6 1980

Prepared by CEMREL, Inc., a private nonprofit corporation supported in part as an educational laboratory by funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Copyright on this document is claimed only during the period of development, test, and evaluation, unless additional authorization is granted by the National Institute of Education to claim copyright on the final version. For information on the status of the copyright claim, contact either the copyright proprietor or the National Institute of Education.

Copyright 1979, CEMREL, Inc.

Library of Congress catalog card number 79-54738
Manufactured in the United States of America

CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, MO 63139

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... vii

FOREWORD..... xiii

BASIC SKILLS IN URBAN SCHOOLS: A VIEW FROM THE BILINGUAL CLASSROOM.... 1

INTRODUCTION..... 1

I. BILINGUAL EDUCATION: DEFINITION AND LEGAL MANDATE..... 2

II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM AND THE REST OF THE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY..... 6

III. NOTES FROM THE BILINGUAL CLASSROOM..... 12

IV. LIMITATIONS TO UNIFORM EFFECTIVENESS..... 16

REFERENCE NOTES..... 19

REFERENCES..... 20

Acknowledgments

The Urban Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., would like to thank the National Institute of Education and the Regional Joint Planning Group of the Urban Education Program for its support and assistance in planning the conference.

Conference Chairperson

Harriet Doss Willis
Director
Urban Education Program

Conference Participants

Nettie S. Ammer
Research Associate
St. Louis University

Eva Baker
Director
Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA Graduate School of Education

Carrie E. Bash
Division of Community Programs
Urban League of St. Louis

Isabel Beck
Co-director
Language & Communications Unit
Learning Research and Development Center
University of Pittsburgh

Janet Cheatham Bell
Urban/Ethnic Studies Coordinator
Indiana Department of Public Instruction

David Bennett
Deputy Superintendent
Milwaukee Public Schools

Edward Binkley
Director of Research & Evaluation
Metro Schools
Nashville, Tennessee

Milton Bins
Senior Associate
Policy Development
The Council of Great City Schools
Washington, D.C.

Dean Bowles
Director
Home-School-Community Project
Wisconsin Research and Development Center

Ronald A. Boyd
Associate Superintendent
Department of Education
State of Indiana

Emerson Brown
Board of Directors
CEMREL, Inc.

L.D. Buford
Principal
St. Louis Public Schools

William D. Callian, Jr.
Assistant Superintendent
Curriculum Instruction
Memphis City Schools

Angeline P. Caruso
Associate Superintendent
Department of Curriculum & Instructional Services
Board of Education
City of Chicago

Courtney Cazden
School of Education
Harvard University

Ned Chalker
Teaching & Learning Program
National Institute of Education

Francis S. Chase
Director of Urban Education
Dallas, Texas

Rosemary Christensen
Director of Indian Education
Minneapolis Public Schools

Doris J. Clemons
Region Five Office
Detroit Board of Education
Detroit, Michigan

Frances Coe
Board of Directors
CEMREL, Inc.

David Colton
Graduate Institute of Education
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

Lloyd M. Cooke
Vice Chairman
Economic Development Council of New York City

Dallas Daniels
Director
Equal Employment Opportunity
Indianapolis Department of Public Instruction

A. W. Dirks
Director
Research, Planning & Development
Wichita Public Schools

Lorenza Dixon
Curriculum Coordinator
Indianapolis Public Schools

John W. Dobbs
Assistant Superintendent
School & Community Affairs
Department of Education
State of Michigan

Domingo Dominguez
Director
Bilingual & Migrant Program
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Ronald Edmonds
Director
Center for Urban Studies
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Nancy Evers
Department of Educational Administration
University of Cincinnati

Joseph L. Felix
Director
Program Evaluation
Cincinnati Public Schools

Marian Kilbane-Flash
Supervisor
Research & Development
Cleveland Public Schools

Anita Ford
Co-chairman
Citizens Education Task Force
St. Louis, Missouri

Ruges R. Freeman
Coordinator
Secondary Student Training
Southern Illinois University
Edwardsville, Illinois

Gary Gappert
New Jersey Department of Education

Booker Gardner
Wisconsin Research & Development
Center for Individualized Schooling
Madison, Wisconsin

Howard Gholson
Policy Analysis
Title I
U.S. Office of Education

Henry Givens
Assistant Commissioner
Department of Elementary &
Secondary Education
State of Missouri

Edmund Gordon
Director
Institute for Urban &
Minorities Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Milton Goldberg
Educational Organizations &
Institutions
National Institute of Education

John H. Grate
Director
Planning & Development
Cincinnati Public Schools

Eldon Grossner
Manager
LEA Services
Illinois Office of Education

Rex Hagans
Northwest Regional Educational
Laboratory

Robert J. Havighurst
Department of Education
The University of Chicago

Garland M. Hawkins
Director
Music Education
Curriculum Center School Dist. 189
East St. Louis, Illinois

Paul Hill
The Rand Corporation

Keith Hyde
Planning & Development
Des Moines Public Schools

John Ingram
Wisconsin Research & Development
Center for Individualized Schooling

Barbara Jackson
Associate Dean
Department of Administration &
Supervision
School of Education
Atlanta University

James N. Jacobs
Superintendent
Cincinnati Public Schools

Sylvia K. Jones
State & Federal Grants
Toledo Public Schools

Preston C. Kronkosky
Field Services & Dissemination
Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory

Daniel U. Levine
Director
Center for the Study of
Metropolitan Problems
in Education
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Joseph D. Liggins
Assistant Superintendent for Staff Development
Houston Independent School District

Reece Little
Director of Curriculum Development
Jefferson County Public Schools
Louisville, Kentucky

Irene Lober
Superintendent
University City Public Schools
St. Louis, Missouri

William Lobosco
ESEA Title I
U.S. Office of Education

Catherine Lyon
Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA Graduate School of Education

Mary Meehan
District Coordinator
The School District of Kansas City

LaMar Miller
Director of Secondary Education
New York University

Len Nachman
Division of Planning & Development
Minnesota Department of Education

Tom Odneal
Director
Title IV
Missouri Department of Education

Joan Orender
Project Coordinator for Distribution of Information
Nebraska Department of Education

George A. Parry
George A. Parry & Associates
River Forest, Illinois

William Phillips
Minneapolis Public Schools

Andrew C. Porter
Institute for Research on Teaching
College of Education
Michigan State University

Electra Price
Oakland Unified School District
Oakland, California

Walter E. Richardson
Supervisor
Compensatory Instruction
Columbus Public Schools

J. Robert Sampson
Assistant Manager
Program Planning & Development
Illinois Office of Education

Judah L. Schwartz
Professor of Engineering, Science and Education
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Cleona Shortridge
St. Louis Public Schools

Barbara Shull
Conference on Education
St. Louis, Missouri

Edward E. Smith
Right to Read Effort
Washington, D.C.

Douglas Smith
Administrative Assistant to the Governor
State of Michigan

Frank Sobol
Basic Skills Group
National Institute of Education

George Spicely
U.S. Office of Education

Jane Stallings
Stanford Research Institute

Tom Stefonek
Director of Planning & Evaluation Research
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Vera John-Steiner
Department of Educational Foundations
College of Education
The University of New Mexico

Ronald Stodghill
Associate Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

Marilyn Suydam
ERIC Information Analysis Center for Science, Math & Environmental Education
The Ohio State University

Maud Thomas
U.S. Office of Education
Kansas City Regional Office

Concepcion Valadez
Graduate School of Education
University of California
Los Angeles

Mamie Wandick
Program Officer
U.S. Office of Education
Kansas City Regional Office

Phyllis Weaver
School of Education
Harvard University

Billy-Belle Weber
Weber, Fuhrmann & Associates
East St. Louis, Illinois

Joyce Weddington
Director
Research and Evaluation
Memphis City Schools

Rachel T. Weddington
University Dean for Teacher Education
The City University of New York

Lores Wells
Harris Teachers College
St. Louis, Missouri

Robert Wentz
Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

Barbara Woods
Afro-American Studies
St. Louis University

Saul Yanofsky
National Institute of Education

Savannah M. Young
St. Louis Public Schools

Allen F. Zondlak
Director of Planning
Detroit Public Schools

URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM STAFF

John Bass
Resource Coordinator

Alfreda Brown
Resource Specialist

Pamelia Coe
Research Associate

Eileen Hamilton
Secretary

Nellie H. Harrison
Dissemination-Curriculum Specialist

Donald Miller
Research Advisor

Harriet Doss Willis
Director

Astacia Wright
Research Assistant

STAFF FOR WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT TEACHING AND LEARNING IN URBAN SCHOOLS?

Harriet Doss Willis
Editor

Margaret Solomon
Manuscript Editor
Production Coordinator

Linda Cambell
Office Manager

Marlene Dandridge
Floor Clerk

Arneita Gray
Secretary

Angela Reed
Secretary

Dian Taylor
Secretary
Office Manager

Karen Temmen
Secretary

Foreword

This monograph is one of a series of papers on the issues of instruction and learning in urban schools that were presented at a conference held July 10-14, 1978, in St. Louis, Missouri, sponsored by the Urban Education Program, CEMREL, Inc., and supported by the National Institute of Education. It is our hope that both the conference and the series of fourteen monographs that resulted from it will assist educational researchers and school practitioners in identifying and analyzing instructional and learning problems in urban school settings, and will contribute to the development of strategies for the improvement of schooling for students.

Titled "What Do We Know About Teaching and Learning in Urban Schools?", the 1978 conference focused on an examination of research findings on the teaching-learning process in areas most germaine to and under control of the schools. The key problems to which the papers are addressed are the assessment of learning outcomes and the analysis of the relationships between instructional and other inputs and learning outcomes. Important contextual issues not under the full control of schools, such as community and parental involvement and the impact of federal and state governments in improving educational opportunities, were addressed at the conference as well.

The conference was conceived, in part, as an initial step in the development of a state-of-the-art review of the most critical issues faced by educators in urban schools who struggle with the morass of general educational problems, exacerbated by decreasing public confidence in large city schools, declining student enrollment, and increasing numbers of poor and minority students. While the conference does not exhaust discussion of the problems

that are particularly significant in the urban school setting, it forms a convenient focus for viewing the larger issues affecting education in our cities.

The educational innovation and change growing out of more than ten years of effort since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 -- the primary stimulus for federal support of research and development in education -- has had the least impact on the student populations typical of the urban school setting. With this concern as a primary consideration, ten months prior to convening the conference, CEMREL's Urban Education Program had begun work with a network of twenty big-city school districts and state departments of education in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. Thus, the conference and the research findings of national authorities was undertaken to lay a foundation for future work in urban educational research and development and to undergird present efforts at improvement of schools in the region.

The Conference Design

To guide the development of the presenters' preparation of their papers, topical questions were prepared for them by Urban Education Program Staff and a paper format was recommended. Each presenter prepared a full paper based on the topical questions and results were summarized by the writers during general sessions of the conference. Because of a wide range of perspectives held on the conference issues, discussions precipitated by reactor panels composed of other prominent researchers, practitioners, and community leaders in education followed each general conference session. More than one hundred educational researchers and practitioners from across the country attended the conference. The invited participants came from school districts and state departments of education from nineteen states; thirteen institutions of higher education; four federal agencies; numerous educational laboratories and research and development centers; and seven social service agencies.

The conference was divided into two types of sessions: general sessions, wherein the nationally recognized speakers who wrote papers presented their summaries; and forum sessions, wherein reactors helped analyze the presentations and examine the concrete recommendations put forth by the general-session speakers. All participants were encouraged to present questions and reactions during these forum sessions.

Francis S. Chase, Director of Urban Education Studies, Dallas, Texas, gave the keynote address at the opening session of the conference, a banquet on Monday evening, July 10. His topic, "Promising Developments in Urban Education," summarized field studies that he was conducting under sponsorship of the Council of Great Cities Schools and the University Council for Educational Administration under a grant from the Spencer Foundation. Chase is Professor Emeritus of the University of Chicago, where he also served as Chairman and Dean of Education for ten years.

The Conference Topics

Each of the presenters had been asked to design a paper by responding to salient topical questions, drawn up by CEMREL's Urban Education Staff. The questions that were posed originally for each of the writers are presented below. Most of the resulting papers were developed into monographs for this series.

Compensatory Education: A Congressional Perspective Christopher T. Cross Minority Staff Director Committee on Education and Labor U.S. House of Representatives.	What is the current state of the evidence concerning projected changes in legislative mandates, and what may we expect related to changes in policy governing federally funded compensatory education programs?

Effective Teacher-Support Systems to Improve Instructional Conditions in Schools Joseph D. Liggins Assistant Superintendent for Staff Development Houston Independent School District	What teacher support systems are most effective in improving instructional conditions for students? What is the role of in-service training, and what types of in-service training can be recommended to urban educators? What other resources--such as additional curricular materials, support from teacher aides and volunteers, time re-allocations, team teaching arrangements, etc.--can be demonstrated to be effective in improving students' learning opportunities? What is the state of the evidence?
Assessment That Respects Complexity in Individuals and Programs Judah L. Schwartz Professor of Engineering, Science and Education Massachusetts Institute of Technology	How can we best measure and analyze the effects of instruction on students' learning in the major school subjects: What are the most appropriate times and strategies for measuring the effects of schooling on student learning? What do we learn from means of assessment other than standardized achievement testing? When and under what circumstances is it most appropriate to use alternative or complementary strategies for assessing program effectiveness?
Achievement Tests in Urban Schools: New Numbers Eva Baker Director Center for the Study of Evaluation University of California, Los Angeles	How can we best measure and analyze the effects of instruction on students' learning in the major school subjects? What are the most appropriate times to measure the effects of schooling on student learning? What are the cautions which should be taken into account before any attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of programs primarily on the basis on standardized achievement data, especially when the number of individual implementations is large and the actual conditions under which the implementations took place are not well documented?
Summer Drop-off and The Effectiveness of Compensatory Instruction Paul T. Hill The Rand Corporation	What has the era of compensatory education program development contributed to knowledge about achievement in the basic school subjects in urban schools? Where is the evidence? What, if anything, does the evidence indicate about methods for improving basic skills achievement? What, if any, recommendations can be made to school district planners on the basis of existing evidence?

Instructional Ingredients for the Development of Beginning Reading Competence
Isabel Beck
Co-Director
Learning Research and Development Center
University of Pittsburgh

Much research, program development, and implementation of efforts to improve achievement in basic school subjects has been concentrated in the area of reading. What approaches to instruction in reading have been successful in increasing achievement? Is there evidence that certain approaches are best suited to the needs of particular populations? Do these effects generalize to other areas of school learning, such as mathematics, social studies, and science?

A Discussion of The Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling
Ronald Edmonds
Director
Center for Urban Studies
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Are there schools that have demonstrated a higher degree of effectiveness in the delivery of instruction in the basic school subjects than others serving similar student populations (in terms of socioeconomic backgrounds, family characteristics, minority populations, etc.)? What characteristics distinguish these schools from less successful schools in similar situations? What is the evidence that the explanatory characteristics have been correctly identified, and how strong is that evidence?

The Educational Promise of Cultural Pluralism
Vera John-Steiner and Larry Smith
Department of Educational Foundations
College of Education
The University of New Mexico

How can we approach problems of teaching and learning in urban schools so that the racial and cultural diversity of the school population is recognized, respected, and utilized constructively, to the extent possible? How do we differentiate between basic academic skills, which all students need to acquire for successful participation in our hetergeneous society, and curriculum decisions which can and should be tailored to the needs and interests of different sub-cultural groups? Do students benefit from participation in racially and culturally hetero-geneous classrooms, or perhaps from certain kinds of heterogeneous instructional settings but not others? What is known about these issues, and how much consensus is there about the cultural values on which schooling must be based?

New Perspectives on School District Research and Evaluation Catherine Lyon Center for the Study of Evaluation University of California, Los Angeles	What is the role of research and development processes in improvement of instruction and learning in basic school subjects in large urban systems? In what form are these processes being applied to the teaching and learning process in urban schools? What is the evidence and how solid are the indications that use of these proceses has resulted in improved student achievement?
Effective Teaching and Learning in Urban Schools Jane A. Stallings and Shirley W. Hentzell Stanford Research Institute	Looking specifically at the interaction of student, teacher, curricular and school organization characteristics, what instructional conditions encourage achievement in basic school subjects? What evidence is there, and how good is it? How are the effects of instructional conditions on student achievement measured? On the basis of existing evidence and trends, what recommendations can be made for improving students' instructional environments?
Mathematics and The Urban Child Marilynn Suydam Center for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education The Ohio State University	Mathematics is a school subject which i generally considered basic, insofar as mathematical skills are required for successful adult functioning in our complex society. What evidence is there to indicate which approaches to instruction in mathematics have been successful in increasing achievement? Is there evidence that certain approaches are best suited to the needs of particular populations? Do these effects generalize to other areas of school learning, such as reading, social studies, and science?
Basic Skills in Urban Schools: A View From The Bilingual Classroom Concepcion Valadez Graduate School of Education University of California, Los Angeles	Since the second largest minority population served by many urban school districts is a bilingual population, what is the current state of the evidence about the effects of programs developed especially for bilingual students? What, if anything, does the evidence indicate about the effects of such programs on basic skills achievement?

School-Community Relations and The Urban School Dean Bowles Director Home-School-Community Project Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning	What do we know or what can we learn about the influence of parental and community involvement in schooling on student achievement? How does parental and community involvement affect the teaching-learning process? If information is not available to answer these questions on even a tentative basis, what types of research are recommended to study this aspect of students' lives more effectively?
Frank Sobol Basic Skills Group National Institute of Education	Are there research and development products which have contributed to improved instruction and increased student achievement in basic school subjects in large urban school systems? What is the evident and how solid are the indications that use of these products has resulted in improved student achivement?
A Summary of The Conference Findings Edmund W. Gordon Director Institute for Urban and Minority Education Teachers College Columbia University	In light of the evidence produced by examination of these issues, what concrete recommendations can be made to school districts concerning the improvement of instruction and learning in basic school subjects? In light of the same evidence, what research and development agenda should be the focus of future study and program development?
Dr. Francis S. Chase, Director of Urban Education Dallas, Texas	Keynote Speaker for Conference Banquet: "Promising Developments in Urban Education"

--Harriet Doss Willis
Director
Urban Education Program

I WAS. . .I AM. . . .SERE

i was eager, curious, listo to learn
but your foreign tone, your unconcern
made me slow, miedoso and I ran inside myself,
i repeated first grade. . . failed all your tests
and marched the "route," the "track"
of the slow learner, la clase especial, the retarded.
remedies were given me when it wasn't me
who was el enfermo (if not i. . .then. . .who?)
later the school spat me out, rejected
I felt failure. . . .herido i was too confused
to really see myself as being conqueror.

i am now the same, the thirst i have to learn
will not be quenched with mirages of education,
my parents and mis hermanos care and they will work,
they will see to it no dollar sign stands to stop me,
they will see that the truth i seek, the wisdom,
will not be watered down with meaningless programas.
i'm refusing second rates, discriminating looks
and foreign ways and further more i'll let no one
look down upon my name, my language and my past.

i'll be, seré, you wait and see, the great contributor
i'll share my talents and my spirit with my country.
the indio noble and the regal spaniard run in me
as i chase balls in the playgrounds of your schools
and they'll emerge together and i will never again
be invisible, without a word, afraid or made to think
that society has already a place assigned for me,
i'll choose a lugar myself among the truly free.

(Abelardo, 1973)

Basic Skills in Urban Schools: A View from the Bilingual Classroom

Concepcion M. Valadez
University of California, Los Angeles

INTRODUCTION

Bilingual education is an educational approach that is currently mandated for all schools of the nation where there are students who are limited English speakers or who speak no English at all. The federal and state legislation provides the financial and technical assistance for the implementation of these programs, yet the success rate of bilingual education has had serious constraints. This presentation explores the reasons for the slow gains in the goals and objectives of this educational innovation. Some of the factors impeding the fulfillment of the possibilities of bilingual education are the school-community sentiment, the limitations of preparation of the teaching personnel, the lack of appropriately developed teaching materials and the scarcity of adequate evaluation instruments.

Even with the many constraints with which bilingual education has been operating, there are numerous examples indicating that initiating a child's formal education in his or her home language can make important differences in such a child's success in school, and very likely, in adult life.

CONCEPCION VALADEZ is Director of the Bilingual Teacher Credential Program and Professor of Early Childhood Education and Curriculum at the Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles.

I. BILINGUAL EDUCATION: DEFINITION AND LEGAL MANDATE

Bilingual education is a phrase that has gained household currency in this country during the last few years, yet it is often used with contradictory definitions, evoking conflicting feelings from different groups of people. It may be wise to distinguish between attitudinal definitions and those that more objectively describe the pedagogical approach intended.

To those who view it negatively, bilingual education simply means that some foreign language will be used for instruction, and to them the use of any language other than English in a classroom in the USA is equivalent to being un-American. If these individuals happen to be teachers, bilingual education may mean a threat to job security. To still others, it may mean changes in a system they feel they know, even if they agree the status quo has shortcomings.

On the other hand, those who view bilingual education favorably may do so because to them it makes sense to teach children by the language in which they think and speak. They may see bilingualism as a national asset. Others, like school officials, may see this innovation as a way of jarring teachers who have become complacent, tired, or perhaps even obsolete in their teaching approaches.

There are many other reasons for both negative and positive attitudes toward bilingual education; the above is only a sample. But devoid of the emotional coloring, the essential meaning of the phrase "bilingual education" is that students will receive instruction in two languages. In this country, in our public schools, we are talking about English and the dominant language of the student, when this language happens to not be English. If the student in the bilingual classroom is English-dominant the languages which will be used for his or her instruction will be English and the language of one of the principal ethnolinguistic groups of the

particular school community. Thus, we find bilingual programs that are English-Spanish, English-Tagalog, English-Portuguese, etc. The basic definition also assumes that teaching methodology and classroom materials will incorporate the cultural background of the children, and the teaching of English as a second language to the children who come from other language backgrounds. Less emphasized, but part of the definition is that the children in the programs who are native speakers of English will learn the other language of the program as a second language. English-speaking Americans can therefore become bilinguals in the bilingual classrooms.

Bilingual Education is Mandated

While bilingual education is not a recent invention in this country,* it is an unprecendented occurrence as we know it at the present time with legislative mandates and accompanying funding levels. The special emphasis on the formal instructional activities offered to the hundreds of thousands of children whose dominant language is not English has accelerated since 1968, when the first bilingual legislation was enacted. Lyndon B. Johnson, then president, signed the Bilingual Education Act with the following words:

> This bill authorizes a new effort to prevent dropouts; new programs for handicapped children; new planning help for rural schools. It also contains a special provision establishing bilingual education programs for children whose first language is not English. Thousands of children of Latin descent, young Indians, and others will get a better start--a better chance--in school....
>
> What this law means is that we are now giving every child in America a better chance to touch his outermost limits--to reach the farthest edge of his talents and his dreams. We have begun a campaign to unlock the full potential of every boy and girl--regardless of his race or his region or his father's income.

* The German language was used for instruction in public schools in Pennyslvania during the 1830s. In Ohio, there was English-German instruction in some communities which had large German populations during a period of 77 years, 1840 - 1917. (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1975)

President Johnson was articulating the statement of policy that the law was establishing:

> Sec. 702. In recognition of the special educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary programs designed to meet these special educational needs. For the purpose of this title, "children of limited English-speaking ability" means children who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English. (20 U.S.C. 880 b) Enacted January 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title VII, Sec. 702, 81 Stat 816. (United States Commission for Civil Rights, 1975, p.1)

Since 1974, technical assistance centers have been established across the country to help school districts provide the kind of education that these laws dictate. We hear of districts that are in noncompliance with the Lau Decision, and the Lau Centers' offers to assist them. There are National Dissemination and Assesment Centers, like the one at the California State University, Los Angeles, directed by Dr. Charles Leyba, and Cross Cultural Resource Centers, like the one directed by Professor Esteban Arvizu at the California State University, Sacramento, California.

In addition to the strength of the Federal Law of 1974, and the supporting services made available from Washington, supplementary legislation has been authorized by many of the states* that have substantial numbers of students who are limited English speakers (LES) and non-English speakers (NES). The state laws are particularly important because they address the specific needs of their region and because they impact directly on the teacher certification agencies for their particular state.

---

* The following states are among those with state legislation for bilingual education in 1978: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, and Wisconsin. (UCLA, Center for the Study of Evaluation. Bilingual Education, State and Federal Legislative Mandates. Los Angeles: California State University National Dissemination and Assessment Center, 1978)

The Bilingual Education Act and Title VII, the funding category, therefore initiated bilingual education as a prescribed approach to learning needs of large groups of children, ages 3 to 18, in each state of the nation. However, due to various factors, including the lack of enforcement power of the initial law, many children who needed this special type of education were not receiving it, and the school districts did not appear to be moving towards developing the capabilities to offer bilingual instruction. The 1974 suit against the San Francisco School District by the Lau family resulted in the subsequent Lau-Nichols decision and the stronger, 1974 Bilingual Education Act. The "Policy Appropriations" of this law read as follows:

> Sec. 702. (a) Recognizing--
> (1) that there are large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability;
> (2) that many of such children have a cultural heritage which differs from that of English-speaking persons;
> (3) that a primary means by which a child learns is through the use of such child's language and cultural heritage;
> (4) that, therefore, large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability have educational needs which can be met by the use of bilingual educational methods and techniques; and
> (5) that, in addition, children of limited English-speaking ability benefit through the fullest utilization of multiple language and cultural resources--
> the Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States in order to establish equal educational opportunity for all children (A) to encourage the establishment and operation, where appropriate, of educational programs using bilingual educational practices, techniques, and methods, and (B) for that purpose, to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies, and to State educational agencies for certain purposes, in order to enable such local educational agencies to develop and carry out such programs in elementary and secondary schools, including activities at the preschool level, which are designed to meet the educational needs of such children; and to demonstrate effective ways of providing, for children of limited English-speaking ability, instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language to achieve competence in the English language. (81 Stat, 816; 84 Stat. 151. 20- USC 880b., U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1975)

II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM AND THE REST OF THE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY

Whenever we want to discuss an innovation in schooling, it is wise to look at the way innovation was begun and at the way it is perceived by those not directly involved with the change. "What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all its children. Any other ideal for our schools is narrow and unlovely; acted upon, it destroys our democracy." This is what John Dewey wrote in The School and Society in 1899. In studying what is happening with bilingual education in the schools we must ask ourselves if the community wants all of its children to receive benefits from attending school. We've seen that it is strong legislation that is forcing the schools to act and develop instructional programs that use the child's home language. The degree with which the school personnel, the school administration, and the society at large identify with the need for the innovation will affect the level of success which the new educational approach will meet.

The Goals of the Program, as Seen by the School and by the Community

Every educational program has general objectives that respond to overt or implied goals set by society or by the group that determines policy. In the case of bilingual education, the goals may vary from those that would have all persons from all ethnolinguistic groups be able to speak English exclusively, to those societal goals that see benefits in having a bilingual population and a multicultural society. At one extreme, then, we have the schools which are overtly aiming for transitional programs -- from first language to English, and at the other end are those advocating full bilingualism for all their students.

In the first instance, we have bilingual education planned as an approach to accelerating the acquisition of English. Teaching children in their own

first language* is seen as a temporary situation, and changeable as soon as the students learn enough English to be able to receive their instruction in that language.

The full bilingualism model, on the other hand, promotes the maintaining and developing of the first language as well as the learning of the second language to the extent that instruction in all subjects could be received in either language (Fishman & Lovas, 1972).

Between the two positions described are a number of variations. Monoliterate is the label given to those programs where instruction in reading and language arts is only provided in English, while the first language is used only for oral language development. Partial bilingualism is found promoted in yet another program variation. In these programs, reading and language arts may be taught in the first language as well as in English, but the first language is used for instruction for subjects that are considered "less rigorous," such as art, history, literature. The use of English is exclusive when teaching courses like science and mathematics.

There is an additional model that we don't hear much about because it is usually not funded by public funds, nor is it mandated at this time, but which might come to our attention in the future. This is the language restoration model, which has as a goal the restoring of a language no longer used by the immediate family members, but which was/is used by the student's grandparents, or other more distant relatives, and where a cultural identification with that language still exists (Valadez-Love, 1975).

How the larger community sees the bilingual program is equally important to how the linguistic minority may see it. There may be segments of the community who differ radically with respect to what they want the bilingual

---

* First language in this paper is used synonymously with mother tongue, or the first language learned and spoken by the student.

program to accomplish. The literature speaks of acculturation and assimilation versus the maintenance of ethnic identity and cultural pluralism (Kjolseth, 1972). These are concerns which are viewed differently by different ethnic groups, and are likely to be seen differently by different members of our society at large. Because of the unpredictability of the questions, each school-community must be studied on its own to find its goals and expectations of its school programs and what it wants for its children.

The Social Dynamics of the School and the Program

The relationship of the bilingual program to the rest of the school may be indicated by answers to the following questions. The order in which they are asked is not important.

1. What proportion of the school population is being served by the bilingual program?

In some schools the bilingual program is organized as a school within a school, serving a small proportion of the total student population. In other places, the entire school is structured so that each student receives instruction bilingually. This second type of school indicates that the population is predominantly non-fluent in English or indicates that the school climate is favorable to bilingualism for all children. We might also find that both situations coincide in some schools. We might find school-within-a-school organizational patterns where there is strong support for bilingualism by the total school environment, or there may be no identification by the school at large with the smaller unit.

2. What is the proportion of English speakers to the NES* and LES children in the program?

---

* NES (Non-English speaking); LES (Limited English speaking)

The response to this question and the previous one will help indicate the status the program has within the school and with the different population groups in the community. Where there are children in the program who are not obligated to be there (like the fluent English speaker), this may be an indication that parents of these children see important benefits to be gained from participating in the program. *

The ethnic and linguistic composition of the program is a significant feature for several reasons which impact directly on the acquisition of basic skills. We have evidence that NES and LES children need native speaking peers in a psychologically supportive environment in order to learn how to speak English with native-speaker fluency (L. W. Fillmore, 1976; Valadez-Love, Note 1). A second crucial reason for noting this proportion is that a program with only NES or LES students may be labeled, or stigmatized, as a special program for those persons with deficiencies. When this occurs the program may be seen negatively by the children enrolled in it, and if this is the case, it will most certainly be considered in a negative light by the high status segments of the school and community.

3. What is the SES of each of the ethnic groups being served by the program?

The question of SES, again, is important because children will be more likely to have social interaction across groups if there is no stigma against mixing with the "other" students. Be it otherwise, the school personnel, as well as the parents of the higher staus children, unconsciously, or even overtly, may project negative attitudes towards the low SES students. This situation may be more likely to develop if there is a large difference in SES between groups. This problem of course, is not

---

* Some parents may see bilingualism as a personal asset--as an integrative feature--while others may see it as valuable in an instrumental way.

insurmountable, nor is it present in all the schools with such student compositions. Nevertheless, it is found frequently enough to merit pointing out. *

The Bilingual Program, the Administrative Staff and the Teaching Personnel

Anyone who has participated in a school community as a teacher, librarian, cafeteria helper, or any other staff member will agree that there exists something called "school climate." For purposes of this discussion, it is important to know who sets the tone for the climate surrounding the bilingual program. One place to explore is the principal's office and other school administrative positions. The integration with or the alienation of the bilingual program from the rest of the school at the teaching personnel level is frequently influenced by the leadership from the principal's office. There are a number of questions that should be asked to determine the level of support the program might be receiving.

1. Does the building principal agree that bilingual education is a valid educational approach? Is the principal sympathetic to change?

The principal may never have received an explanation of what bilingual education is all about. He or she may be sympathetic but unsure of what his or her role should be. The principal may also be uneasy because of the extra attention which the bilingual program will bring to the school. Some will resent being coerced into having the special program. Others will not particularly mind having the program there, but will very much dislike the extra work that the bilingual program means to them.

2. What is the level of training of the bilingual program staff? What proportion of the teachers hold bilingual certification?

---

* Research on racial integration indicates that children don't necessarily mix across ethnic groups simply by being in the same school.

In many places the bilingual mandate caught the schools without properly trained teachers, and in the urgency to start the programs, staffs may be inadequately prepared. Recalling the bilingual legislation, "Recognizing. . .that a primary means by which a child learns is through the use of such child's language and cultural heritage," a question needs to be asked that will indicate to what level the teaching staff know and/or speak the local language variety and to what extent the teachers understand and feel comfortable with the local cultural patterns of the students.

The bilingual program accrues many benefits to the staff, but it also brings them many challenges and demands. It is important to know if the teachers enjoy working in the bilingual program, and if they feel they are growing as teachers and as people, or if they feel overwhelmed by the demands and expectations.

3. How do the teachers outside the bilingual program feel about bilingual education and about the program in their school?

The level of interaction between the staff working primarily with the bilingual program and those teachers in the rest of the school will indicate whether there is integration or separation between the staffs. There are schools that see the bilingual program as a threat or view it with scorn. On the other hand, the new approaches being used by the bilingual teachers may serve to stimulate the rest of the teachers into learning new techniques and prompt them to seek advanced degrees or specialist's certification.

4. Does the program have accessible supportive services?

To a significant degree how the bilingual staff reacts to the demands of the program and to the reception of the other teachers will depend on the supportive services available to them. Bilingual staffs should have access to inservice training and back-up to give the teachers assistance in development of skills with bilingual education methodology.

5. How does the community and the school relate?

There should be a way of determining the quality of the interaction between the school and the parents. The following questions would yield some valuable information:

Is parent involvement encouraged?

Are parents from all ethnic groups of the school active in school organizations? (P.T.A., Room Mothers, Mothers' Clubs, etc.)

Are parents encouraged to participate in the program as classroom volunteers?

What provisions are made to insure successful parental involvement?

Are parents involved in determining any aspects of the curriculum or in the selection of books and materials?

All Title VII programs are required to have advisory groups. How is the advisory group for the particular program selected?

III. NOTES FROM THE BILINGUAL CLASSROOM

Bilingual education is an educational approach expected to remedy the achievement levels of certain groups of children for whom traditional monolingual English instruction has not been effective. We have seen the philosophical and environmental constraints with which these federally mandated educational programs must function. A sample of reactions, based on research studies and personal observations will serve to round out this overview of bilingual education.

There are three complementary topics which address the effectiveness of bilingual education:

1. The acquisition of English, on the part of non-English speakers or limited English speakers (NES, LES)
2. Academic achievement, especially in reading, language arts, and mathematics
3. Self-concept development

The Acquisition of English

Frequently, the concern is voiced that children will be hampered in their learning of English if they receive instruction in their native language for at least part of the day. Numerous research studies from bilingual programs are indicating that the oral language is being learned at an equal or faster rate in the bilingual programs than in the traditional monolingual English classrooms. Analyses of the errors made by the experimental subjects indicate that the syntactic rules of English are being learned even as children are continuing their subject-matter learning in their first language. Two research studies done at Stanford University showed that children in the bilingual programs were gaining control of syntactic structures which were more complex earlier than the control group in the traditional programs (Ramirez, Note 2; Valadez-Love, Note 1).

There are studies indicating that the speakers of English as a second language, having learned from models who speak the "standard" variety, will speak with fewer "grammatical" errors than the native speakers of English in the local community. An interesting aside is that the children learning English as a second language will end up speaking like their classmates if there is any interaction between the ethnic groups, and teachers should incorporate this information in their language arts plans when the two groups work together in class (Valadez, 1978).

The success in learning English as well as these children do in the bilingual context appears to be due to the fact that the second language is taught as a subject in the class. If the language is presented in a systematic manner orally, it will in no way hinder the acquisition rate, but, in fact, it is learned in a more efficient manner as a separate subject than if it is learned at the mercy of attempting to capture cognitive content at the same time. Outside the bilingual programs, the second language is learned at the cost of limited development of the first (native)

language, which is an additional handicap imposed by the monolingual English classrooms on children from non-English homes, given that language is a mediator for cognitive processes.

The Learning of Reading and Writing and Arithmetic

Since 1953 UNESCO has been promoting the teaching of initial instruction in the mother tongue. Bilingual education in this country is clearly demonstrating that literacy skills are transferrable, as are computation skills in mathematics. Reading and writing are thinking skills and the processes that children need to learn in becoming literate will be applicable to any language, once the children have a firm control of that second language.

Currently there are efforts to develop instruments to determine when a child can appropriately begin to read in the second language. (SWRL (Southwest Research and Development Laboratory); The Center for the Study of Evaluation, U.C.L.A.; and the State Department of Education in California are developing tests in this area.) There are many classroom teachers, however, who have been successfully integrating in the English reading programs the children who began their reading instruction in the first language. The usual amount of time reported for learning English well enough to begin reading in that language appears to be between 2 and 3 years. If a child has had 2 or 3 years of success in reading, in a native language, that attitude towards reading will be the first thing to transfer (Thonis, Note 3), and in addition the structural analysis skills, the phonics, and all the other basic processes in reading will be there to be used with the new language arts.

The transfer of writing skills has a very similar success story. Many city bilingual programs are incorporating mixed language in their language arts programs. Teachers have discovered that the informal speech of children

frequently includes the speech style called code switching, which is the shifting back and forth between languages in the middle of sentences when two bilinguals are speaking. Teachers have traditionally used language experience approaches to language development and initial writing. The use of the natural speech of children, when this is a language other than English or when it is English-and-something-else, is a perfect extension of the technique. The result is that children feel positive toward the act of writing--a necessary condition to teaching this basic skill (Welner, 1976).

The Development of Self-Concept and Ethnic Identity

When the notion of bilingual education was first promoted, one of the worries school people and non-ethnic groups expressed was that the children of the ethnic groups would be converted into militant students, or that national separatism would be promoted.* Parents of English-speaking children were worried that their children might forsake their own cultural identity if the other group were being portrayed in too favorable a light (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). What research is indicating is that a positive self-concept is an important ingredient in academic achievement, as is high teacher expectation, and that these two features are prominent in well-developed bilingual programs. The research is indicating that children in bilingual programs become stronger in their identity with their home cultural group and they also have stronger positive feelings towards the other group they are interacting with (Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Politzer & Ramirez, Note 4; Skoczylas, Note 5). The apparent reason for these affective domain changes is that the bilingual program presents both cultures and the children have positive interaction with features of their own culture. Their experiential backgrounds are used in the teaching-learning activities, and the other culture is introduced in a non-threatening and, in effect, attractive and interesting manner.

---

* Hayakawa still thinks that bilingual education in this country can encourage another Quebec, but the situations are hardly comparable (Valadez, 1979a).

IV. LIMITATIONS TO UNIFORM EFFECTIVENESS

While there is evidence that bilingual education can deliver the promises it held out when the legislation was worded, there are serious constraints to uniform effectiveness. The resistance on the part of school personnel has been mentioned. It is useful to note that some of the resistance may be due to the fact that it is bilingual education that is being mandated, but that any change in the school system would meet with some resistance simply because schools are holders of so much traditionalism (Spindler, 1974). Bilingual education also seems to evoke uneasiness in the society at large which is not bilingual, and there appears to be a naturally selfish feeling that if "someone is speaking in a language I do not understand, they must be talking about me." Such an attitude seems to indicate that the United States is largely a monolingual society. Few citizens of other countries would react in a similar manner.

Lack of Properly Prepared Teaching Staff

A problem of no mean magnitude is that of the number of teachers who are properly trained to teach in the bilingual programs. It must be borne in mind that these programs ask that the teacher perform all the tasks that a monolingual teacher must, and then add a dimension with the language and methodology which is appropriate for the other ethnolinguistic group.

All of the states that have bilingual programs are faced with certification problems. There are the crash programs which are offered by the Lau Centers and the various national resource centers. The teacher-training institutions are graduating teachers with various levels of preparation. But the demand for bilingual teachers is overwhelming, and there are many classrooms which simply must operate as best they can.

Lack of Appropriate Teaching Materials and Evaluation Techniques

Two additional areas which plague bilingual programs are appropriate teaching materials and valid tests for measuring growth in skills.

The teaching materials found in bilingual classrooms may or may not be portraying the culture of the students using them. The textbooks are frequently published in other countries. Those for the Spanish-English programs may be from any one of the Spanish-speaking countries. Neither the children, nor the teacher, nor the teacher aide need be from that country, and while the Spanish grammar will be the same in all the countries of the world, there will be lexical items that may confuse the users.

A bigger problem still is that of tests to measure the rate at which the children are learning. The field of evaluation is still in its infancy when it comes to testing children from diverse ethnic and diverse cultural groups. There is every indication that we must test what the children know and what we have taught them, but we have yet to develop ways to do that, because we persist in testing what we have not taught, with tests normed with other children, speaking another language (English) somewhere else.

Finally, there is a need to develop techniques to assess the changes that are occurring at a personal level with children and teachers who are working in the programs and the impact that the programs are having in the school curriculum and in the community.

The hopes and aspirations of the hundreds of thousands of children who speak through Abelardo's poem, "I Was . . . I Am . . . Sere," are depending on bilingual education. This democracy has an obligation to all of its children. This paper has focused on the constraints on complete effectiveness of bilingual education. The public has expected bilingual education to be a miracle cure at a time when our schools are not doing well by any student population.

Our country must begin to see itself as a pluralistic nation, for it can only be strengthened if the potential of so many of its people is not hampered by alienation or stultification in our schools. Bilingual education provides a way to develop the academic capabilities of our diverse ethnic populations, while making them strong as members of their own home cultural group and strong as Americans.

REFERENCE NOTES

Note 1. Valadez-Love, C. The acquisition of English syntax by Spanish-English Bilingual Children. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1976.

Note 2. Ramirez, A. G. The spoken English of Spanish-speaking pupils in a bilingual and monolingual school setting: An analysis of syntactic development. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1974.

Note 3. Thonis, R. Reading is thinking in any language. Paper presented to the Association for Bilingual Education Conference, Fresno, California, 1979.

Note 4. Politzer, R., & Ramirez, A. G. An error analysis of spoken English of Mexican-American pupils in a bilingual school and a monolingual school. Memorandum. Stanford Center for Research in Teaching, Stanford, California, 1973.

Note 5. Skoczylas, R. An evaluation of some cognitive and affective aspects of a Spanish-English bilingual education program. Doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1972.

REFERENCES

Abelardo. I was . . . I am . . . sere. Final report: Bilingual bicultural models. Salem, Oregon: The Valley Migrant League, February, 1973.

Anderson, T., & Boyer, M. Bilingual schooling in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Dewey, J. School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900.

Fishman, J. A., & Lovas, J. Bilingual education in a sociolinguistic perspective. In Spolsky, B., The language education of minority children, Newbury House, 1972.

Kjolseth, R. Bilingual education programs in the United States: For assimilation or pluralism? In Spolsky, B., The language education of minority children, Newbury House, 1972.

Lambert, W., & Tucker, G. R., Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Newbury House, 1972.

Spindler, G. Education and cultural process: Toward an anthropology of education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. A better chance to learn: Bilingual-bicultural education. Washington, D.C., Author, 1975.

Valadez, C. La educacion bilingue: Experimento vigente en el centro escolar Norte-Americano. Primer simposio cultural Chicano, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. Mexico, D. F., in press (1978).

Valadez, C. How multicultural is your multicultural program? Aztlan International Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences. 8(2), 1979a.

Valadez, C. Identity, power and writing skills: The case of the bilingual student. In M. Whitman et al. (Eds.), Writing: The nature, development and teaching of written communication. Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc., 1979b.

Valadez-Love, C. Modelos de ensenanza bilingue y sus implicaciones. Memorias de las Segundas Jornadas de Bilinguismo. Universidad de Santiago, Santigao de Compostela, Spain, 1975.

Welner, S. R. Teaching poetry writing to the bilingual child. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District Compensatory Instructional Program, 1976.

OTHER TITLES IN THE SERIES

Volume 1
Compensatory Education: A Congressional Perspective
Christopher T. Cross, the U.S. House of Representatives

Volume 2
Effective Teacher-Support Systems to Improve Instructional Conditions in Schools
Joseph D. Liggins, Houston Independent School District

Volume 3
Assessment That Respects Complexity in Individuals and Programs
Judah L. Schwartz, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Volume 4
Achievement Tests in Urban Schools
Eva Baker, University of California, Los Angeles

Volume 5
Instructional Ingredients for the Development of Beginning Reading Competence
Isabel L. Beck, University of Pittsburgh

Volume 6
A Discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling
Ronald Edmonds, Harvard University and New York City Public Schools

Volume 7
Summer Drop-Off and the Effectiveness of Compensatory Instruction
Paul T. Hill, The Rand Corporation

Volume 8
The Educational Promise of Cultural Pluralism
Vera John Steiner and Larry Smith, The University of New Mexico

Volume 9
New Perspectives on School District Research and Evaluation
Catherine Lyon, University of California, Los Angeles

Volume 10
Effective Teaching and Learning in Urban Schools
Jane A. Stallings and Shirley W. Hentzell, SRI International

Volume 11
Mathematics and the Urban Child: A Review of Research
Marilyn N. Suydam, The Ohio State University

Volume 12
Basic Skills in Urban Schools: A View from the Bilingual Classroom
Concepcion M. Valadez, University of California, Los Angeles

Volume 13
School-Community Relations and Student Achievement
John E. Ingram, Jr. and Lois I. Bartels, St. Louis Public Schools and CEMREL, Inc.

Volume 14
What Do We Know About Teaching and Learning In Urban Schools: A Summary of the Conference Findings
Edmund W. Gordon, Columbia University